

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Carson City District Office

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Creator: Dan Westermeyer

Field Office: Stillwater

Lead Office: Stillwater Field Office

Case File/Project Number: SRP-LLNVC01000-12208

Applicable Categorical Exclusion 516 DM 11.9: H. Recreation Management (1): Issuance of SRP's for day use or overnight use up to 14 consecutive nights; that impacts no more than 3 staging area acres; and/or for recreational travel along roads, trails, or in areas authorized in a land use plan.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-2012-C010-0054-CX

Project Name: Eastern Sierra Jamboree ATV Ride

Project Description: The Northern Mono Chamber of Commerce has submitted an SRP application to conduct an ATV Jamboree on public lands southeast of the Hawthorne area between June 13 and June 16. The event will start in Coleville, California and then head down to Hawthorne Nevada across USFS lands and onto BLM lands. The Stillwater F.O. is the lead office with the Sierra Front F.O. providing authorization. Participants would overnight in Hawthorne then ride back to Coleville the second day. The proposed routes traverse BLM SFO (~52 miles), BLM SFFO (~ 25miles), and USFS lands under separate permit from the Bridgeport Ranger District.

The applicant proposes to travel on bladed roads and existing routes with no cross country travel. Approximately 70 % of the course is located on routes permitted for use by the Sierra Trails Dogs and Modesto Ridge Runners under CX in 2011. The remaining 30% of the proposed routes are on similar roads as the other 70%. The event participation is set at a minimum of 10 and maximum of 30 participants with no spectators. The nature of the event is back-country touring with guides and support provided by the applicant. Participants would ride in small groups spread out along the route. The event is non-competitive and is not a race. This group has conducted this event previously on USFS lands in the area under USFS permits.

This type of recreational use of public lands is considered to be casual use but requires a Special Recreation Permit due to the commercial aspect of the event. The event qualifies for Categorical Exclusion under the NEPA process based upon the reference to 516 DM listed below.

Applicant Name: Susan Robbins

Project Location: Lyon and Mineral County E-SE of Hawthorne

For the NV BLM event route, the following township, range and sections apply within Mineral County. The remainder of the course is on the NV BLM Sierra Front F.O. in Lyon County, or the Humboldt-Tioyabe National Forest:

Stillwater Field Office

T6N, R28E, Sec. 1,2,3
T6N, R29E, Sec. 5,6,7
T7N, R28E, Sec. 6, 19, 29,30,33,34
T7N, R29E, Sec. 13,14,15,19,20,21,22,23,24,26,27,28,29,31,32,33
T7N, R30E, Sec. 18
T8N, R28E, Sec. 4,6,7,8,9,18,19,29,30,31,32
T9N, R27E, Sec 2,3,4,11,12
T9N, R28E. Sec. 6, 7,17,18,20,29,31,32
T10N, R28E, Sec. 18,19,30,31

Sierra Front Field Office

T7N, R27E, Sec. 12, 13, 24,
T8N, R27E, Sec. 12
T9N, R27E, Sec 2,3,4,11,12
T10N, R26E, Sec. 23, 24, 25, 26, 36
T10N, R27E, Sec. 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33

The course crosses the following 1:24:000 quads on NV BLM lands:

Stillwater Field Office

Butler Mountain, Nevada, PE 1988;	Copper Canyon, Nevada, PE 1989
Corey Peak, Nevada, PE 1989	Mitchel Spring, Nevada, PE 1989
Mount Grant, Nevada, PE 1989	Ninemile Ranch, Nevada, PE 1989
Lucky Boy, Nevada PE 1989	Hawthorne West, Nevada, PE 1987
Hawthorne East, Nevada 1987	

Sierra Front Field Office

Pine Grove Spring, Nevada, PE 1988	Mitchel Spring, Nevada, PE 1989
Ninemile Ranch, Nevada, PE 1989	Butler Mountain, Nevada, PE 1988

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 77 miles in both field offices

Land Use Plan Conformance:

Section 8 – REC-2: Desired Outcomes, 1: “Provide a wide variety of recreation opportunities on public land under the administration of the Carson City Field Office.”

Section 8 – REC-2: Land Use Allocations, 1: “All public lands under CCFO jurisdiction are designated open to Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) use unless they are specifically restricted or closed.”

Section 8 – REC-6: Administrative Actions, 4: “On public land designated open for off highway vehicles, there will generally be no restrictions on use. Organized competitive OHV events have been allowed in Mason Valley, Wilson Canyon, Hungry Valley OHV Area, Moon Rocks, Lemmon Valley MX Area, Dead Camel Mountains, Salt Wells Area, Wassuk Range and in the Frontier 500 and Carson Rally OHV corridors. Organized events will be handled on a case-by-case basis through the Special Recreation Permit review and Environmental review process. Organized activity is generally restricted to existing roads and trail

Name of Plan: Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001)

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria: (Specialist review: initial in appropriate box)

<i>If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.</i>	YES	NO
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? (Range-Jill Devaurs)		JGD
2. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? (Archeology, Recreation, Wilderness, Wildlife, Range by allotment, Water Quality)		JGD JGD JGD
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (PEC)		JGD
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		JGD
5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? (PEC)		JGD
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		JGD
7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office? (Archeology)		JGD
8. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the list of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? (Wildlife)		JGD
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (PEC and Archeology)		JGD JGD
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		JGD
11. Would the Proposed Action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007)? (Archeology)		JGD
12. Would the Proposed Action contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and EO 13112)? (Range-Jill Devaurs)		JGD

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:

During ID Team review of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

- Planning Environmental Coordinator, Steve Kramer: *SK 5/12/2012*
- Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: *JD 5-13-12*
- Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: *DW 5/12-12*
- Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: *JW 5-12-12*
- Archeology, Susan McCabe: *SMC 5/14/12 APC 21*
- Water Quality, Gabe Venegas: *GV*
- Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: *CS 5/14/12*

CONCLUSION: Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

Approved by:

Teresa J. Knutson
Teresa J. Knutson
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office

6/7/2012
(date)